

Application No. 10/733,983

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are in the case.

The applicants have studied the Office Action dated April 28, 2005 and have made the changes believed appropriate to place the application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 8-10, 16-21, 27-29, and 38 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Subramani et al. (WO97/42648). Claim 27 is directed to an apparatus comprising, inter alia, "a coil having a first face facing said plasma containment region and a second face facing said first wall, said second face including a protruding member integral with said coil; and a fastener adapted to fasten said coil protruding member to said first wall."

It is the Examiner's position that the Subramani reference shows an apparatus having "a protruding member (534) integral with said coil and defining a threaded first recess (Fig. 7); ..." April 28, 2005 Office Action, page 3. The applicant respectfully disagrees. The Subramani reference makes clear that the nut 534 cited by the Examiner is not an integral member of the coil. Instead, the nut 534, coil 104 and bolt 532 are separate members of an assembly:

"A nut 534 having flanges 536 passes through openings in the coil 104, first cover member 504 and the first insulative base member 502 and threadably fastens to the bolt 532. The nut flanges 536 engage the coil 104 and compress the assembly of the standoff 500 together to secure the standoff and coil 104 to the shield wall 140." Subramani et al. (WO 97/42648), page 18, lines 3-6.

Moreover, it would not be obvious to modify the nut 534 of the Subramani et al. reference to be an

integral member of the coil 104. The Examiner has cited no teaching, suggestion or motivation for such a modification to the coil 104 of the Subramani reference. On the contrary, it is submitted that the cited portions of the Subramani reference make clear that the nut 534 is a separate member which engages the coil. Independent claims 29 and 38 and 39 may be distinguished in a similar fashion.

Additional claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 27, 29, and 38. The rejection of these claims is improper for the reasons given above. Furthermore, these dependent claims include additional limitations, which in combination with the base and intervening claims from which they depend provide still further grounds of patentability over the cited art. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 27, 29 and 38 and the claims dependent thereon is improper and should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 1 is directed to an apparatus comprising, inter alia, "a coil having a first face facing said plasma generation area and a second face facing said first wall, said second face defining a fastener recess extending partially through said coil; and a fastener member adapted to fasten said coil to said first wall wherein said coil second face fastener recess is adapted to receive said fastener member." As set forth above, it is the Examiner's position that the nut 534 is a "protruding member (534) ... integral with said coil and defining a threaded first recess..." However, it is clear from the above that the nut 534 of the Subramani et al. reference cited by the Examiner engages the coil 104 and is not a portion of the coil 104. On the other hand, while the coil 104 does have openings, it is clear as shown in Fig. 7 of the Subramani reference cited by the Examiner that the openings extend completely through the coil to permit the nut 534 to extend into the coil opening from one side of the coil and the bolt 532 to extend into the coil opening from the other side of the coil 104.

Additional claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1. The rejection of these claims is improper for the reasons given above. Furthermore, these dependent claims include additional limitations, which in combination with the base and intervening claims from which they depend provide still further grounds of patentability over the cited art. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon is improper and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has made various comments concerning the Subramani reference. Applicants respectfully disagree with respect to several of those comments. Applicants have addressed those comments directly hereinabove or the Examiner's comments are deemed moot in view of the above response.


Claims 7 and 11-15 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Applicants acknowledge with thanks the Examiner's indication of allowability for claim 30.

PATENT
004486USAC01
7828.7036C

In view of all of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested and allowance at an early date is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William K. Konrad
Reg. No. 28,858
Customer No. 24033

10/28/05
Date:

Direct All Correspondence to:
Patent Counsel
Applied Materials, Inc.
P.O. Box 450A
Santa Clara, CA 95052

Direct Telephone Calls to:
William K. Konrad
(310) 556-7983

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail on the date indicated above and is addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.


William K. Konrad

10/28/05
(Date)